

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/537,118 03/29/2000		03/29/2000	Harry Dugger III	PHCO3.0-008	7521	
20582	7590	07/12/2004		EXAMINER		
JONES DAY				HAGHIGHATIAN, MINA		
51 Louisian	•	V.W 20001-2113	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
***************************************	10., 50	20001 2110		1616		

DATE MAILED: 07/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No). <i>I</i>	Applicant(s)					
		09/537,118	ε	DUGGER, HARRY					
	Office Action Summary	Examiner		Art Unit					
		Mina Haghigha		1616					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication reply	on appears on the cov	er sheet with the cor	respondence ad	dress				
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION of time may be available under the provisions of 37 C SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days to period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory re to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the end patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ION. CFR 1.136(a). In no event, howon. To a reply within the statutory make the period will apply and will expirent the statute, cause the application.	wever, may a reply be timely ninimum of thirty (30) days w re SIX (6) MONTHS from the n to become ABANDONED	y filed vill be considered timely e mailing date of this co (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status									
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	08 April 2004.							
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠	This action is non-fi	nal.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Disposit	ion of Claims								
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.								
Applicat	ion Papers								
9)[The specification is objected to by the Exa	aminer.							
10)	10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
	Applicant may not request that any objection t								
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the c The oath or declaration is objected to by the								
Priority (ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docu 2. Certified copies of the priority docu 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Base the attached detailed Office action for	ments have been rec ments have been rec e priority documents h sureau (PCT Rule 17.	ceived. ceived in Application nave been received 2(a)).	n No in this National :	Stage				
Attachmen	t(s)								
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		Interview Summary (P' Paper No(s)/Mail Date						
3) Infon	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/5 r No(s)/Mail Date	SB/08) 5)	Notice of Informal Pate Other:		9-152)				

Art Unit: 1616

DETAILED ACTION

The receipt of the Request For Reconsideration and amendments filed April 08, 2004 is acknowledged. Claims 35-36 are deleted and no new claims are added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 26, 30, 33, 37, 53, 56, 58-60 and 79 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanios et al (5,719197).

Kanios teaches compositions and methods for topical administration of pharmaceutically active agents. Topical administration means a direct contact of the formulation with tissue, such as skin or membrane, particularly the oral or **buccal mucosa** (col. 1, lines 29-59).

Kanios discloses that the composition comprises a therapeutically effective amount of at least one pharmaceutically active agent, a pharmaceutically acceptable solvent for the active agent (col. 2, lines 22-28). The solvent is preferably a polyhydric alcohol such as polypropylene glycol, ethylene glycol, also solvents such as fatty acids such as oleic acid, as well as fatty esters or alcohols. The solvent is present in an amount from about 20 to 50 weight percent based on the total weight of the composition (col. 4, lines 1-49). The concentration of the solubilized active agent can range from 1 and 50% by weight (col. 8, lines 1-9). The acceptable carrier is intended to be any

Art Unit: 1616

suitable finite or non-finite carrier including liquids, semi-liquids or solid carriers. Thus the active agent may be admixed with carriers such as spray-solution or any non-finite carrier known in the art for delivery of active agents (col. 8, lines 54-67; col. 9, lines 19-27). Other additives may be incorporated into the formulations such as flavorings (col. 10, lines 48-56).

Kanios discloses that pharmaceutically active agents suitable for such formulation include narcotic analgesics, hormones, antihistamines, antibiotics such as erythromycin, antinauseants such as ondansetron, antiulceratives such as cimetidine, immunosuppressants such as cyclosporine, benzodiazepines, clozepaine, etc (cols. 12-31).

Kanios does not exemplify a buccal spray formulation, however it does clearly teach that the formulations may be in the form of a spray solution for administering to the oral mucosa and thus to one of ordinary skill in the art, forming a buccal spray containing an active agent and a solvent, would be a logical extension of the disclosure of Kanios.

Claim 27-29, 31-32, 34, 38, 54-55, 57 and 61 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kanios et al (5,719,197) as applied to claims 26, 30, 33, 37, 53, 56, 58-60 and 79 above, and further in view of Singer et al (5,364,616).

Kanios, discussed above, lacks specific disclosure on the concentration range and examples of the flavoring agent.

Art Unit: 1616

Singer teaches methods for prevention or treatment of gingivitis or periodontitis comprising topical <u>administration</u> to <u>oral cavity</u>, a composition comprising a safe and effective amount of a selective histamine-2 receptor antagonist compound, and oral care compositions used thereof. Compositions comprise about 0.001 to about 20% of a H-2 antagonist such as cimetidine, about 2 to about 99% of an oral carrier and about 0.04 to about 2% of flavoring agent by weight. The suitable carriers include <u>ethanol</u>, <u>water and polyhydric alcohols</u> such as glycerin, polyethylene glycol and propylene glycol. Suitable <u>flavoring</u> agents include menthol, oil of wintergreen, oil of <u>peppermint</u>, oil of clove, etc (col. 15-17).

Singer discloses that the said compositions, suitably in the form of a mouthspray, may optionally include other ingredients such as other active agents including antibiotics, anti-inflammatories, vitamins and minerals (col. 18-19).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, given the general teachings on the topical (oral) spray formulations of Kanios to look in the art for relative and suitable concentration range and examples of the flavoring agent with the reasonable expectations of preparing an oral formulation that is acceptable and tolerable by patients, since flavoring is an important aspect of oral formulations.

Art Unit: 1616

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed April 08, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that Kanios is teaching compositions and methods for the topical administration of active agents to a mammal, in particular, anesthesia and local anesthetic agents.

Applicant states that Kanios describes its compositions as "flexible, finite, bioadhesive compositions for topical application", defining finite as non-spreading. Applicant is correct in stating that the invention of Kanios is essentially about topical application by a flexible or adhesive composition. However, it is stated that preferred embodiments do not teach away from a broader disclosure. See *In re Susi*. As mentioned in previous Responses and Office Actions, Kanios is teaching other forms of compositions including liquid sprays. Applicants attention is drawn to column 9, lines 19-27, where Kanios recites "For example, in ONE embodiment, the anesthetic agents are dissolved in a solvent....and then added to an adhesive .In ANOTHER embodiment, the resulting mixture is in cream, gel...., spray solution or other non-finite composition....". Also in column 10, lines 57-65, Kanios discloses that ".....when a non-finite carrier such as an ointment, gel, lotion...or spray-solution is used".

It is further noted that the instant claims are "composition" claims, and the product's properties are considered inherent. Therefor if Kanios is disclosing a formulation containing the same ingredients as the instant claims are reciting, then it is taken that both formulations will be absorbed systemically once administered to the oral

Art Unit: 1616

mucosa. It is also noted that "for transmucosal absorption" is considered <u>intended use</u> and is not given weight during examination.

Kanios, therefor, teaches the formulations and the method of administration.

With regards to Singer's reference, Applicant argues that the formulations of Singer do not remedy the deficiencies in Kanios. The reasoning is that Kanios is disclosing a finite composition and not a sprayable solution. As mentioned above, Kanios does disclose solutions for spraying and teaches mucosa absorption and application.

Applicant argues that that there is no motivation to combine the disclosures of Kanios and Singer. Kanios is clearly teaching a spray solution formulation containing an active, a solvent and an additive such as flavoring agent, which may be administered to the oral mucosa. Singer is teaching formulations in a spray solution form which include an active, a solvent and a flavoring agent such as oil of peppermint, and discloses suitable concentration ranges for the flavoring agents. Clearly one of ordinary skill in the art, given the formulations of Kanios would be motivated to look in the art for specific flavoring agents and a suitable concentration range because both formulations are sprayed in the oral cavity and flavor in such formulations is an important factor in patient compliance.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mina Haghighatian whose telephone number is 571-272-0615. The examiner can normally be reached on core office hours.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary L. Kunz can be reached on 571-272-0887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mina Haghighatian

Examiner Art Unit 1616 July 06, 2004